



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,310	09/22/2005	Hannu Makela	47121-5008-00 (215668)	1918
55694	7590	01/06/2009	EXAMINER	
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH (DC) 1500 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-1209				NGUYEN, CHUONG P
3663		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
01/06/2009		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/550,310	MAKELA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Chuong P. Nguyen	3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicants' 10/20/2008 Amendment, which directly amended claims 1, 6; added new claims 11-12; and traversed the rejection of the claims of the 06/19/2008 Office Action are acknowledged.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 3, 6, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarangapani (IDS reference – 6,055,042) in view of Admission of Prior Art (APA).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Sarangapani discloses a method of preventing a mine vehicle from colliding comprising: determining for the mine vehicle at least one safe area (i.e. zone of

interest) provided within an area between minimum distances (i.e. near range) and maximum distances (i.e. far range) determined with respect to the vehicle (Fig 2 “204, 208”; Fig 3 “308”; Fig 4-5 “406, 408”; col 3, lines 6-60; col 4, line 35 – col 5, line 22); scanning the environment in front of the vehicle when driving the vehicle in one movement direction (Fig 3-7; Fig 8 “802”; col 3, lines 6-60; at least col 4, line 35); carrying out a first collision examination wherein the safe area in front of the vehicle is monitored (Fig 8 “804-812”). Sarangapani does not explicitly disclose the steps of issuing collision warning messages if an obstacle is detected within the safe areas and wherein the mine vehicle is stopped when the collision warning message is issued.

APA teaches in the same field of endeavor such steps of issuing collision warning messages if an obstacle is detected within the safe areas and wherein the mine vehicle is stopped when the collision warning message is issued (Specification – Background of the invention; [0003]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate such steps of issuing collision warning messages if an obstacle is detected within the safe areas and wherein the mine vehicle is stopped when the collision warning message is issued as taught by APA in the method of Sarangapani for providing the collision warning messages since it has been held that if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond his or her skill (MPEP 2143).

Still regarding claims 1 and 11, although Sarangapani does not explicitly disclose the steps of determining also at least one sideward safe area for the vehicle, determining an obstacle-free route on the basis of the forward scanning results, and determining points in a sideward

direction of the vehicle to restrict the route; forming memory points on the basis of coordinates of the points restricting the route, and storing the memory points in the control system; and carrying out a second collision examination wherein at least one sideward safe area of the vehicle is monitored; however, it is well known in the art of experimentation that one derives his or her own program / algorithm to operate a system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of determining / monitoring the sideward safe area for the vehicle as claimed in the method of Sarangapani, since it is well known in the art to derive a program / algorithm to operate a system.

Regarding claim 3, see the rejection of claim 1 above regarding the memory points as claimed.

Regarding claims 6 and 12, Sarangapani discloses in Fig 1-7 a mine vehicle (i.e. mining truck) comprising at least: a movable carrier (i.e. mobile machine 102) that is driven in a first movement direction and in a second movement direction, at least one scanner (i.e. near range obstacle sensor 204; far range obstacle sensor 208), and a control system (i.e. control system 212) including at least a first control unit arranged on the carrier (col 2, line 53 - col 3, line 13); and wherein at least one scanner is configured to scan the environment in front of the vehicle in order to detect obstacles (col 3, lines 6-60; at least col 4, line 35); at least one safe area (i.e. zone of interest 308, 406, 408) defined by minimum distances (i.e. near range) and maximum distances (i.e. far range) determined with respect to the vehicle is determined in the control system (col 4, line 48 - col 5, line 13); and which control system is configured to monitor scanning results (Fig 8 “804-812”). Sarangapani does not explicitly disclose issuing collision warning messages if an obstacle is detected within the safe areas and wherein the mine vehicle is

stopped when the collision warning message is issued. APA teaches in the same field of endeavor such issuing collision warning messages if an obstacle is detected within the safe areas and wherein the mine vehicle is stopped when the collision warning message is issued (Specification – Background of the invention; [0003]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate such issuing collision warning messages if an obstacle is detected within the safe areas and wherein the mine vehicle is stopped when the collision warning message is issued as taught by APA in the system of Sarangapani for providing the collision warning messages since it has been held that if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond his or her skill (MPEP 2143).

Still regarding claims 6 and 12, although Sarangapani does not explicitly disclose at least one safe area in a sideward direction of the vehicle is further determined, the control system allows several memory points including their position information to be stored therein the memory points defining sideward points of the route and based on the forward scanning results, and the control system is configured to monitor at least one sideward safe area of the vehicle and to issue a collision warning message if an obstacle is detected within the safe area in front of the vehicle and if even one of the memory points resides within the safe area being monitored; however, it is well known in the art of experimentation that one derives his or her own program / algorithm to operate a system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the program / algorithm of

determining / monitoring the sideward safe area for the vehicle as claimed in the system of Sarangapani, since it is well known in the art to derive a program / algorithm to operate a system.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarangapani modified by APA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ishida et al (IDS reference – 5,572,428) and Sturges et al (IDS reference - WO 02/030792).

Regarding claim 2, Sarangapani modified by APA do not explicitly disclose the steps of simulating in advance, on the basis of position and control data, the path of movement of at least one part of the vehicle in the control system; carrying out the second collision examination by taking into account the path of movement obtained by simulation; and adjusting, on the basis of the second collision examination, steering movements of the vehicle in order to avoid overstepping the sideward safe area. Ishida et al teach in the same field of endeavor the steps of simulating in advance, on the basis of position and control data, the path of movement of at least one part of the vehicle in the control system; carrying out the second collision examination by taking into account the path of movement obtained by simulation (Fig 2 “S3-S11; at least col 5, line 40). Sturges et al teach in the same field of endeavor the step of adjusting, on the basis of the second collision examination, steering movements (i.e. turn moments) of the vehicle in order to avoid overstepping the sideward safe area (Fig 9; pages 18-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate such steps as taught by Sturges et al and Ishida et al in the method of Sarangapani modified by APA for determining and controlling the potential collision of the sideward area of the vehicle since it has been held that if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill

in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond his or her skill (MPEP 2143).

6. Claims 4-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarangapani modified by APA as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Burns (IDS reference – 6,393,362).

Regarding claim 4, Sarangapani modified by APA disclose the step of controlling the vehicle unmannedly (**Sarangapani** – col 2, lines 58-61; col 4, line 55+; col 6, line 63+). Sarangapani modified by APA do not explicitly disclose the step of utilizing a data transmission connection provided between the first control unit residing on the carrier of the vehicle and a second, external control unit. Burns teaches in the same field of endeavor in Fig 10 the step of utilizing a data transmission connection provided between the first control unit (i.e. control modules 80) residing on the carrier of the vehicle and an external control unit (i.e. base station 76) (col 9, lines 1-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate such step as taught by Burns in the method of Sarangapani modified by APA because it does no more than yield predictable results of preventing collision for a vehicle since it has been held that the combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results (MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 5, Sarangapani modified by APA do not explicitly disclose the step of updating dimensions of at least one safe area on the basis of the location of the mine vehicle. Burns teach in the same field of endeavor the step of updating dimensions of at least one safe area (i.e. safety envelope) on the basis of the location of the mine vehicle (col 5, line 24 – col 6,

line 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate such step as taught by Burns in the method of Sarangapani modified by APA because it does no more than yield predictable results of preventing collision for a vehicle since it has been held that the combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results (MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 8, Sarangapani modified by APA do not explicitly disclose the minimum distances of the safe area are determined according to the external shape and structure of the mine vehicle. Burns teach in the same field of endeavor the minimum distances of the safe area (i.e. minimum physical operating space) are determined according to the external shape and structure of the mine vehicle (col 5, line 35 – col 6, line 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the safe area determination as taught by Burns in the system of Sarangapani modified by APA because it does no more than yield predictable results of preventing collision for a vehicle since it has been held that the combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results (MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 9, Sarangapani modified by APA disclose the mine vehicle is unmanned (**Sarangapani** – col 2, lines 58-61; col 4, line 55+; col 6, line 63+). Sarangapani modified by APA do not explicitly disclose the first control unit is through a data transmission connection connected to a second, external control unit in order to transfer control data between the control units. Burns teach in the same field of endeavor in Fig 10 the first control unit (i.e. control modules 80) is through a data transmission connection connected to a second, external control unit (i.e. base station 76) in order to transfer control data between the control units (col 9, lines 1-

27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate such data transmission for the control units as taught by Burns in the system of Sarangapani modified by APA because it does no more than yield predictable results of preventing collision for a vehicle since it has been held that the combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results (MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 10, Sarangapani modified by APA do not explicitly the control system is configured to update at least one safe area on the basis of the location of the mine vehicle. Burns teach in the same field of endeavor the control system is configured to update at least one safe area (i.e. safety envelope) on the basis of the location of the mine vehicle (col 5, line 24 – col 6, line 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate such control system as taught Burns in the system of Sarangapani modified by APA because it does no more than yield predictable results of preventing collision for a vehicle since it has been held that the combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results (MPEP 2143).

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarangapani modified by APA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gunderson et al (6,642,839).

Regarding claim 7, Sarangapani modified by APA discloses in Fig 3-5 the scanners (i.e. near and far range obstacle sensors) directed in a first movement direction and provided with a safe area of its own (**Sarangapani** – col 5, line 35 – col 6, line 23). Sarangapani does not

explicitly disclose the scanner directed in a second movement direction and provided with a safe area of its own. Gunderson et al teach in the same field of endeavor a laser scanner directed in a second movement direction (i.e. rear) and wherein each movement direction is provided with a safe area of its own (Fig 9-12; col 6, line 44 – col 7, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate such safe area and control system s as taught by Gunderson et al in the system of Sarangapani modified by APA because it does no more than yield predictable results of scanning the obstacle / object surrounding the vehicle for collision detection since it has been held that the combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results (MPEP 2143).

8. While patent drawings are not drawn to scale, relationships clearly shown in the drawings of a reference patent cannot be disregarded in determining the patentability of claims. See In re Mraz, 59 CCPA 866, 455 F.2d 1069, 173 USPQ 25 (1972).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

10. The cited prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuong P. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3445. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CN

/Jack W. Keith/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3663